



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

b

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,549	11/28/2001	Emie F. Brickell	10559-505001/P8790X	7968
20985	7590	03/31/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ELISCA, PIERRE E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/998,549	BRICKELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Pierre E. Elsca	3621

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09/30/2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-11,13-16,18-23,25-29,31-34 and 36-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-11,13-16,18-23,25-29,31-34 and 36-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.
---	--

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment 09/30/2004. The advisory office action mailed on 11/01/2004 has been withdrawn.
2. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-16, 18-23, 25-29, 31-34, and 36-40 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-16, 18-23, 25-29, 31-34, and 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being unpatentable over Gasser et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,224,163) and Chang et al. (U.S. pat. No. 6,157,953) in view of Bowman-Amuah (U.S. Pat. No. 6,601,192)..

As per claims 1, 3-11, 13-16, 20-23, 25-29, 31-34, and 38-40 Gasser substantially discloses a method/system for delegating authorization from one entity in a distributed computing system to another for a computing session, wherein a session public/private encryption key pair is utilized for each computing session (which is readable as Applicant's claimed invention wherein it is stated that receiving from a delegator), comprising:

receiving, from a delegator, a designation of a role and a delegate to assume the role (see., abstract, col 3, lines 7-48);

receiving, from a credential service provider, an indication that the designation is valid (see., abstract, col 3, lines 26-48, specifically wherein it is stated that if the user's name if found on the list next to the requested access, access will be granted, col 6, lines 33-66); and generating a delegation credential in response to receiving the indication (see., col 3, lines 7-48, specifically wherein it is stated that if the user's name if found on the list next to the requested access, access will be granted). The limitation wherein said send a message to the delegator indicating that the delegation credential has been assigned is also disclosed by Gasser in the abstract, col 3, lines 7-48, specifically wherein it is stated that delegating authorization from one entity in a distributed computing system. A private key (or encoded delegation) enables each entity to identify itself to other entities and to encode certain message. When a user requests access to a system resource, the user's name is compared to the resource's access control list. If the user's name if found on the list next to the requested access, access will be granted (granted or credential has been assigned).

It is to be noted that Gasser fails to explicitly disclose the limitation wherein said sending the delegation credential to a verification service that compares the selected delegation credential to permissible delegation credentials. However, Chang discloses a method/apparatus of securing access to a service manager for the administration of services residing on multiple service host computers from an administration server computer. The service host computers for verification at the service hosts by examining data relating to user privileges (credentials verification) stored in the user profile data repository (see., abstract, col 3, lines 48-67, col 12, lines 1-43, col 13, lines 3-40). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the teaching of Gasser by including the limitation detailed above as taught by Chang because this would control access and authentication of a user or delegator. Gasser and Chang fail to explicitly disclose Applicant's newly added limitation wherein said generating a report via the verification service regarding usage of the delegation credential. Bowman-Amuah discloses a report architecture within environment services supports the generation and delivery of reports (see., abstract, col 1-col 78). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Gasser and Chang by including the limitation detailed above as taught by Bowman-Amuah because this would deliver service and control access of a user or delegator.

As per claims 18, and 36, Gasser discloses the claimed method of storing the delegation credential in a database maintained by a delegation service provider (see., col 3, lines 7-15, specifically wherein it is stated that public key are stored with the entities names in a global naming service).

As per claims 19, and 37, Gasser discloses the claimed method wherein identifying comprises checking a hash of the confirmation code to identify the delegator (see., col 5, lines 10-67, specifically wherein it is stated that RSA cryptography or has function).

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/30/2004 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new ground (s) of rejection. Necessitated by amendment.

REMARKS

6. In response to Applicant's arguments, Applicant argues that the prior art of record Gasser and Chang fail to disclose the recited feature wherein said "generating a report via the verification service regarding usage of the delegation credential". However, the newly found prior art Bowman-Amuah discloses a report architecture within environment services supports the generation and delivery of reports (see., abstract, col 1-col 78). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Gasser and Chang by including the limitation detailed above as taught by Bowman-Amuah because this would deliver service and control access of a user or delegator.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre E. Elisca whose telephone number is 703 305-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 703 305-9769. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Pierre Eddy Elisca

Primary Patent Examiner

March 29, 2006